

is that cultural behavior is in general structured and nonrandom and, as a corollary, that the distribution of the by-products of that behavior will also tend to be structured and nonrandom. The distributions of isolated finds and small artifact clusters are therefore considered valuable to the understanding and elucidation of the full range of settlement and subsistence activities of past cultures (Plog and Hill 1971; Goodyear 1975). Architectural sites which are abandoned and no longer in *systemic* context (Schiffer 1977) will also be identified under this definition.

*Sampling Considerations:* some mechanism for acquiring a representative sample of the full range of cultural variability (in this case *sites*) is necessary to the model building process. As will be discussed below, models are developed on the basis of observations of the environmental and cultural characteristics of a large number of sites. If only a restricted portion of a region is examined, the corresponding models will tend to reflect only the activities undertaken within that area and not necessarily the full behavioral range of the cultural systems involved. It is relatively well known, for instance, that Archaic period hunter-gatherer societies often traversed extremely large regions during their yearly quest for food and other raw materials. Consequently, a small scale archaeological investigation might record only a fraction of the (types of) sites associated with those societies (c.f. King 1978). System reconstruction then, would only be partial. The recent highway surveys are a case in point and will be discussed further in this volume.

Small scale surveys, however, can and should contribute to the modeling process (c.f. Cheek, et al. 1977; Talmage, et al. 1977). Contributions can only be realized, however, if strict methodological controls are employed during survey. In other words, the sample provided by a survey can be evaluated only when it is described in detail. If the survey methods are explicitly stated, the results of the investigation can then be integrated into a broader regional analysis. A number of small projects (samples) can contribute as much to the modeling process as a few large projects when incorporated into a broader framework.

In undertaking a survey of any area, several basic assumptions are usually made. It is assumed, for instance, that the survey results represent some fraction of the total sites or cultural manifestations in the project area; it is not normally assumed that a 100% sample has been derived, regardless of the intensity of the survey. The nature of the archaeological record, under most circumstances, precludes the possibility of a complete or total recovery survey in the eastern U.S. (c.f. House and Schiffer 1975; House and Ballenger 1976; Lovis 1976; Chartkoff 1978). The factors of erosion, sedimentation, forest growth, and quite frequently, contemporary human development, serve to limit even the most intensive of investigations. A comprehensive archaeological survey is one which covers as much of the project area as physically possible with sufficient surface and subsurface examinations to record all detectable large or moderate-sized sites. Small sites, such as a hunting camp consisting of a scatter of chipped stone debris, may also be recorded, but this is often little more than a fortuitous occurrence. The sample of sites derived from a